DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 118 SO 002 113

AUTHOR Haavelsrud, Magnus
TITLE The Impact of the Communication Structure on American and Canadian Pre-Adults' Orientations to War and Peace.
INSTITUTION United States International Univ., San Diego, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Council for Conflict and Peace Research (Norway).
PUB DATE 23 Nov 71
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention, National Council for the Social Studies, Denver, Colorado, November, 1971

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Tests; *Communications; *Concept Formation; *Conflict; Mass Media; Peer Relationship; *Political Socialization; Religious Factors; Secondary School Students; Social Factors; *Socialization; Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Canada; Peace; United States; *War

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to compare the relative impact of communication structures and the utility of sixteen sources of orientations in the development concepts related to peace and war among high school students. 197 students from Seattle, Washington and 227 from Vancouver, British Columbia were asked to respond to four open-ended questions on war, peace, and causes of war, and the prevention of war. They were then asked to rate the utility of their sources of information: TV at home, radio, newspapers, magazines, books, movies in theaters, teachers, textbooks, movies in school, TV in school, minister or teacher in church, and content of religion. Statistical analysis utilized a one-way analysis of variance, the dependent variable being the source ratings. 21 of the 64 comparisons had greater utility for the Seattle sample; the print and motion picture sources had greater utility for the Vancouver sample. A clarification of possible causative variables is provided in an interpretive section of the paper. A related document is SO 001 842. (Author/DJB)

ED058118

ED002113

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE IMPACT OF THE COMMUNICATION STRUCTURE ON AMERICAN AND CANADIAN PRE-ADULTS' ORIENTATIONS TO WAR AND PEACE*

by

Magnus Haavelsrud

CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY OF TECHNOLOGY IN EDUCATION, LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

U. S. INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY

8655 POMERADO ROAD

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92124

Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Council for the Social Studies

Denver, Colorado

November 23, 1971

* The Council for Conflict and Peace Research, Norway gave financial support to the research reported in this paper.

INTRODUCTION

Pre-adults' conception of war in different countries differ and variables commonly used to explain such differences (e.g. personality variables, age, and social position) seem inadequate when analyzing the etiology of relationships.(1) It is anticipated that the communication structure of a social system is a viable independent variable sui generis. It is also suggested that the greater the difference in communication structure between cultures, the greater will be the usefulness of this variable in explaining the variance found in differing orientations. Hence, in order to investigate this problem one would ideally select samples from a cross-section of different communication and information systems. Galtung's typology of stages of socio-economic development which consists of eight criteria could be used for this purpose.(2) Communication is one of the criteria: The primitive stage is characterized by walking, running, rowing with eye and ear information processing. The traditional stage is characterized by transportation by animals, wheels, sailing with dispatches as the basic information processing mechanism. The modern stage is known by its steam and combustion engine and postal, telephonic and telegraphic communication systems. In the neomodern, stage, jet rockets and tele-satellite systems have arrived on the scene.

Due to resource limitations, samples from each of the four major types of communication structures could not be selected in the present study. Although the two samples in the present study were drawn from two cultures which fall into the modern or neomodern stages (Canada and the U.S.), it is anticipated that the utility of various communication sources will vary.

The purpose of this papers is to compare the relative utility of sixteen sources of orientations in the development of four concepts related to peace and war among high school students in Seattle (United States) and Vancouver, B. C. (Canada).

METHODOLOGY

The research model employed in the present study has been reported on previously.(3) Hence only a short summary of the methodology used will be given. The instrument consists of ten pages. Each page contains (1) questions to measure the individual's orientations to concepts related to war/peace and (2) devices to assess the value of sources as they affected that orientation. It was decided that the inclusion of devices to assess source utility ought to be postponed until all the "orientations" for concepts had been identified. In this way, the orientations identified would not be influenced by the process of judging the value of sources (the latter

were hidden by a cover sheet until all the "orientation questions" had been answered). The utility of a source is assessed by having the subjects indicate on a six-point scale the amount of influence each of a variety of potential sources has had on the respondent as he or she learned the answers to the questions on that page. The sixteen scales are randomized on each page in order to minimize set formation.

The orientations for each concept was measured by asking the following open-ended questions (the abbreviation used later is written in capital letters).

What do you think about when you hear the word "war"?	WAR
What do you think about when you hear the word "peace"?	PEACE
What do you think leads to war?	CAUSES
What do you think can be done to prevent war?	PREVENTION

The two samples in the present study were selected as follows:

Sample 1 (U.S.): This sample consists of 197 high school students drawn from a population of 2000 in a school district in Seattle. The subjects were drawn from classes that were not mandatory for any special group of students. Thus, a representative sample was obtained.

Sample 2 (Canada): This sample consists of 227 high school students drawn from a population of 2400 in Vancouver, B. C. No specific criteria for grouping

students were used. Hence, even if whole classes were tested, a varied composition of students in each class was ensured. A representative sample of the population is thereby selected.

The design used in this experiment is that of a one-way analysis of variance. The independent variable in this experiment is nationality with two levels, viz. Canadian and American. The dependent variable is the rating of sixteen sources of orientation on a six-point scale for each of four concepts, viz. war, peace, causes of war, and prevention of war. It is recognized that conclusions are based on samples of unequal size. However, it was not based on a discrepant value of a small sample versus an appearance of stability gained from a large sample.(4)

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Table 1 shows the relative utility of sixteen sources of orientation for the concept WAR and significant differences between the ratings of Seattle and Vancouver samples. It is apparent that two family sources are of greater utility for high school students in an urban setting in the U. S. than for a comparable population in Canada. The same conclusion applies to the peer group. Only two mass media sources (books and movies in theaters) have significantly different utility for the development of the war-concept; these two sources

having greater impact among Canadians. Teachers have a significantly greater utility among American students, whereas the obverse is the case for textbooks as a source of orientation. Finally, the Seattle sample rates "content of religion" significantly higher than the Vancouver sample.

Insert Table 1 about here

Table 2 shows the relative impact of the same sources for formation of the peace-concept. Only two sources are rated significantly different for this concept, viz. movies in theaters and textbooks. These two sources are of greatest utility for the Canadian sample.

Insert Table 2 about here

It is evident from Table 3 that all three family sources are of greater utility for conveying orientations about causes of war among the Seattle subjects. Movies in theaters and textbooks have greater impact among Vancouver subjects. Finally, American students rated "minister or teacher in church" significantly higher than Canadian students.

Insert Table 3 about here

Five sources received significantly different rates for PREVENTION, viz. father, books, movies in theater, textbooks and

movies in school. All these sources, except father, were rated significantly higher by Canadians.

Insert Table 4 about here

Table 5 summarizes the significant differences between ratings by Seattle subjects and Vancouver subjects. Interpersonal sources (family sources, friends, teacher, and minister or teacher in church) are rated significantly higher for the concept WAR and/or CAUSES OF WAR by American students. In addition, the father is rated higher by Seattle subjects for PREVENTION. Two print sources (books and textbooks) are rated higher by Vancouver subjects for two or all four concepts. Motion pictures are also rated higher by Vancouver subjects. Content of religion is more seminal for high school students in Seattle in developing notions about WAR. Reading Table 5 vertically, it is evident that of the eleven sources five are rated significantly higher by Seattle subjects for the concept WAR and four are rated significantly higher for the concept CAUSES OF WAR. The corresponding numbers for the Canadian sample are three and two. When it comes to PEACE and/or PREVENTION OF WAR only one of the eleven sources (father) are of significantly greater utility for the Seattle subjects, whereas two and four sources respectively are of significantly greater utility for the Vancouver subjects.

Insert Table 5 about here

In addition to reporting significant differences in ratings of source utility between the two samples one should emphasize the lack of such significant differences for certain ratings. Ratings of four mass media sources and one school source are not significantly different for any of the four concepts (TV at home, radio, newspapers, magazines and TV in school). It should be emphasized that three of these sources are of primary utility, viz. TV at home, newspapers, and magazines. The average ratings of these sources are higher than any of the other ratings. Radio is secondary and TV in school tertiary as far as average rating is concerned. Finally, as evident from Table 5 some of the eleven sources listed are not rated significantly different for all concepts.

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

In this study the relative utility of sixteen sources of orientationsin the development of four concepts related to peace and war among high schocl students in Seattle and Vancouver, B. C. has been assessed according to student perception. Answers to <u>why</u> certain sources are perceived too be of varying utility for certain concepts in different communication structures are not provided. This is a research question that needs to be tackled. In this context a clarification of possible variables will be provided in the attempt to interprete present findings.

Due to the replicatory nature of the present study and the fact that the two samples are comparable, it is fair to assume that the impact of certain variables commonly used to explain differences are minimal or even absent. Such variables include cognitive structure, social position, and personality variables. Consequently, causes of variance in utility must be sought in the external environment. The communication structure is presumably that part of the external environment exerting greatest impact on concept formation. Hence, the etiology of varying degree of utility in the two samples is centered around differences in communication structure.

Major components of the communication structure include (1) presence of absence of communication channel, (2) duration of exposure, (3) type of message transmitted, (4) presentation form, and (5) source credibility.(5) All sixteen sources are present in both populations. It is hypothesized that maximum utility of a source in the development of a concept depends upon (1) long duration of exposure, (2) message relevant to concept, (3) efficiency in presentation form and (4) high credibility of originator. Minimal utility of a source in the development of a concept will occur when the following conditions are present: (1) short duration, (2) message not relevant to concept, (3) little or no efficiency in presentation form and (4) low credibility of originator.

It is expected that where no significant difference occurred between the two ratings of a source that (1) no major differences are present in the two samples along the above dimensions or (2) if differences occur along some of the dimensions, these differences are without effect due to random variation. For example, it is conceivable that a source may have longer duration of exposure in one setting than in another and at the same time be perceived by observers as being of low credibility. In this manner, one factor difference may outweigh another factor difference. This conclusion applies to ratings of the following sources: TV at home, radio, newspapers, magazines and TV in school. Note that three of these sources (TV at home, , newspapers, magazines) on an average are of primary utility in developing the four concpets.

In cases where significant differences occur it is hypothesized that (1) variation in one or several of the factors is present and (2) these variations are non-random in the sense that the majority will contribute towards lower utility in one setting and higher utility in the other setting. The consistent higher utility of interpersonal sources among Seattle subjects in the development of orientations about WAR and/or CAUSES OF WAR suggests the possibility that these sources are (1) used longer time-wise, (2) more relevant to the two concepts, (3) more intense in the interactions (efficient presentation form), and (4) of higher credibility. Note also that the father is of more utility among Americans in the formation of WAR PREVENTION orientations.

This author tends to believe that explanations (2) and (3) are more appropriate than (1) and (4). It is expected that the intensity of interactions about WAR and CAUSES OF WAR will vary according to the degree of current and foreseeable personal involvement in war. This possibility would seem to be more imminent in the U. S. than in Canada at the time the data were gathered.

The consistent higher utility of the two print sources among Vancouver subjects indicates that Canadian subjects' reading habits (time, intensity) are different and/or the selection of books is different. The amount of exposure to books and textbooks is probably greater in Canada than in the U. S. among high school students and/or the content of the books are more relevant to war and peace concepts.

Movies are also of greater utility among Vancouver subjects. This, again suggests different duration of exposure and/or difference in types of motion pictures seen. The likeliest explanation is that Canadian youngsters go to movies that furnish information about peace and war more frequently.

Content of religion is of more utility in the formation of the war-concept among Seattle subjects than among Vancouver subjects. This may have its cause in more exposure to religious ideas relevant to WAR or the intensity of viewing the problem of WAR from a religious viewpoint is greater in the U. S. setting due to the involvement in Vietnam. It is

unlikely that the credibility of originator is higher in the U. S. than in Canada.

Overall, seven sources are of significantly greater utility for the Seattle subjects in the development of the concepts WAR and CAUSES OF WAR, whereas the corresponding number for Vancouver subjects is three. Only one source is of significantly greater utility for the Seattle subjects in the development of orientations towards PEACE and/or PREVENTION OF WAR, whereas four sources are rated significantly higher among Vancouver students for these concepts. This finding suggests that more sources of orientation in the U. S. at the time this study was done were geared to the development of notions about WAR and CAUSES OF WAR than the development of notions about PEACE and PREVENTION OF WAR. On the other hand, Canadian subjects seem to regard parts of the communication structure more conducive to the development of orientations about PEACE and PREVENTION OF WAR. This conclusion may be explained in terms of the four criteria previously discussed, viz. duration of exposure, degree of relevance of content to concept, degree of efficiency in presentation form, and degree of credibility of originator of communication. In order to find answers to the process of international socialization it seems important to investigate the impact of the interplay of these variables. In cases when samples are drawn from all categories of societies, one would also have to consider the existence or nonexistence of communication agents.

NOTES

(1) M. Haavelsrud "Development of Concepts Related to Peace and War: Impact of Informational Environment." Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D. C. September 7, 1971 P. 21

(2) J. Galtung, "On the Future of the International System," Journal of Peace Research, 1967, pp. 308-312

(3) M. Haavelsrud "Seminal Agents in the Acquisition of International Orientations" (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Washington, 1970, pp. 19-32

(4) Solomon Diamond, Information and Error. Basic Books, Inc., New York, 1959, pp. 126-127

(5) For a description of the impact of the existence or non-existence of certain communication channels and their characteristics see (a) Johan Galtung, op, cit., pp. 308-313 and (b) Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man, The New American Library Inc., 1964 pp. 23-35

For a description of media characteristics, presentation forms, content variables and source credibility see (a) Donald T. Tosti and John R. Ball, "A Behavioral Approach to Instructional Design and Media Selection" AV Communication Review, Vol. 17, No. 1, Spring 1969, pp. 5-26 and (b) Lee Thayer, Communication and Communication Systems, Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Homewood, Illinois, 1968.

TABLE 1: Differences between means in the Seattle sample (S) vs. the Vancouver sample (V) for the rating of sources for the concept WAR (Rank of means in parenthesis)

	SEATTLE	(Rank)	VANCOUVER	(Rank)	$p<.05$
Father	3.57	(7)	2.93	(10)	S>V
Mother	3.16	(9)	2.80	(11)	S>V
Others in family	2.61	(12)	2.48	(13)	
Friends	3.65	(6)	3.30	(8)	S>V
TV at home	4.73	(1)	4.75	(1)	
Radio	3.41	(8)	3.53	(6)	
Newspapers	4.49	(2)	4.52	(2)	
Magazines	4.01	(3)	4.15	(3)	
Books	3.69	(5)	4.06	(4)	V>S
Movies in theaters	2.62	(11)	3.39	(7)	V>S
Teachers	3.98	(4)	3.64	(5)	S>V
Textbooks	2.77	(10)	3.21	(9)	V>S
Movies in school	2.50	(14)	2.80	(12)	
TV in school	1.66	(16)	1.57	(16)	
Minister or teacher in church	2.21	(15)	1.97	(15)	
Content of religion	2.59	(13)	2.22	(14)	S>V

TABLE 2: Differences between means in the Seattle sample (S) vs. the Vancouver sample (V) for the rating of sources for the concept PEACE (Rank of means in parenthesis)

	SEATTLE	(Rank)	VANCOUVER	(Rank)	$p<.05$
Father	3.28	(7)	3.17	(8)	
Mother	3.37	(6)	3.32	(6)	
Others in family	2.77	(13)	2.86	(12)	
Friends	3.80	(2)	3.66	(3)	
TV at home	3.83	(1)	3.85	(1)	
Radio	3.09	(11)	3.40	(5)	
Newspapers	3.59	(3)	3.69	(2)	
Magazines	3.64	(4)	3.56	(4)	
Books	3.12	(10)	3.21	(7)	
Movies in theaters	2.54	(5)	3.10	(9)	V>S
Teachers	3.23	(8)	3.09	(10)	
Textbooks	2.42	(14)	2.78	(11)	V>S
Movies in schools	2.14	(15)	2.36	(14)	
TV in school	1.59	(16)	1.57	(16)	
Minister or teacher in church	2.81	(11)	2.50	(15)	
Content of religion	3.18	(9)	2.84	(13)	

TABLE 3: Differences between means in the Seattle sample (S) vs. the Vancouver sample (V) for the rating of sources for CAUSES (Rank of means in parenthesis)

	SEATTLE	(Rank)	VANCOUVER	(Rank)	$p < .05$
Father	3.41	(7)	2.85	(10)	S>V
Mother	3.12	(10)	2.70	(11)	S>V
Others in family	2.62	(11)	2.37	(13)	S>V
Friends	3.49	(6)	3.21	(8)	
TV at home	4.17	(1)	4.21	(2)	
Radio	3.31	(8)	3.55	(7)	
Newspapers	4.16	(2)	4.42	(1)	
Magazines	3.60	(4)	3.68	(5)	
Books	3.58	(5)	3.90	(3)	
Movies in theaters	2.52	(13)	3.10	(9)	V>S
Teachers	3.98	(3)	3.82	(4)	
Textbooks	3.12	(9)	3.64	(6)	V>S
Movies in school	2.43	(14)	2.56	(12)	
TV in school	1.69	(16)	1.77	(16)	
Minister or teacher in church	2.33	(15)	1.91	(15)	S>V
Content of religion	2.53	(12)	2.24	(14)	

TABLE 4: Differences between means in the Seattle sample (S) vs. the Vancouver sample (V) for the rating of sources for PREVENTION (Rank of means in parenthesis)

	SEATTLE	(Rank)	VANCOUVER	(Rank)	$p<.05$
Father	3.37	(6)	2.99	(10)	S>V
Mother	3.11	(7)	3.01	(9)	
Others in family	2.49	(12)	2.61	(12)	
Friends	3.57	(3)	3.36	(6)	
TV at home	3.58	(2)	3.55	(4)	
Radio	2.97	(9)	3.30	(7)	
Newspapers	3.53	(4)	3.49	(5)	
Magazines	3.52	(5)	3.60	(2)	
Books	3.04	(8)	3.55	(3)	V>S
Movies in theaters	2.03	(14)	2.74	(11)	V>S
Teachers	3.65	(1)	3.69	(1)	
Textbooks	2.56	(11)	3.19	(8)	V>S
Movies in school	2.01	(15)	2.48	(13)	V>S
TV in school	1.54	(16)	1.74	(16)	
Minister or teacher in church	2.48	(13)	2.45	(15)	
Content of religion	2.75	(10)	2.47	(14)	

TABLE 5: Significant differences (P<.05) between means of scales for the Seattle sample vs. the Vancouver sample (S=Seattle, V=Vancouver)

	WAR	PEACE	CAUSES	PREVENTION
Interpersonal:				
Father	S>V		S>V	S>V
Mother	S>V		S>V	
Others in family			S>V	
Friends	S>V			
Teachers	S>V			
Minister or teacher in church			S>V	
Print:				
Books	V>S			V>S
Textbooks	V>S	V>S	V>S	V>S
Motion Pictures:				
Movies in theaters	V>S	V>S	V>S	V>S
Movies in school				V>S
Religion:				
Content of religion	S>V			